DEFENSE planners customarily work five, 10 or 15 years ahead, and this fact, coupled with the difficulty of changing course once the pattern is set, compels the National Guard to do likewise if it is to retain its importance in the structure of National defense, and its relevance to modern needs. This is the factor which led to the creation, nearly two years ago, within the framework of this Association, of a Special Roles and Missions Committee to study the military future of the Army National Guard. Now, this same factor has prompted us to reorganize the Committee which handles Air National Guard matters. This will permit it, too, to take a searching look at the years ahead and at the varied roles which the Air Guard can play in the aerospace force of tomorrow.

The equipment, weapons and force structures which our military forces use today were conceived and designed a decade or more ago, and the structures and tools which defense planners currently are evaluating are those which will come into operational use five, 10 or 15 years from now. Because of the complexity of today’s weapons systems, their cost and the lead time for their development and production grows greater with each passing year. Therefore, decisions are made years earlier than they were in a less sophisticated era, and once made, are difficult to change.

Out of these factors come guidelines which must be recognized and followed if we in the National Guard are to help determine the shape of our own future. The guidelines, simply stated, are these: The Guard, too, must look far ahead. It must analyze the military requirements of five to 10 years hence, as defined by responsible and thoughtful officials of the Army and Air Force. Then, it must stake its claim to those roles and missions which can be performed effectively and economically by a citizen military force.

It hardly needs be added that Guardsmen who are chosen to conduct such studies must do their “homework” thoroughly. Guesswork won’t get by when Guard proposals reach the desks of the analysts in the Pentagon. Finally, we must make our views known early—years ahead of the actual introduction of change—if our opinions are to be heard and heeded.

Some of the ideas developed by the Army Guard’s Special Roles and Missions Committee were incorporated in Army plans for future Reserve Component structural organizations. We are hopeful that the Air Committee, under the leadership of Major General Lewis A. Curtis of New York, likewise will make its mark on the future structure of the Air Force and on the relative importance of the Air National Guard.

Vice Chairmen have been appointed in each of the Air Guard’s major mission areas: Air Defense, Tactical Forces, Communication and Electronics, and Airlift; and before the year ends, each of the four will have taken a long look, not just at current problems but at future Air Force developments. Under the pressure of a looming reduction in the Air Guard’s global transport forces, a study group working under the supervision of Brigadier General William W. Spruance of Delaware, Vice-Chairman for Airlift, already has completed a detailed examination of the airlift picture as it relates to the Guard. Its report, along with some concrete recommendations, will be laid on the desks of appropriate Defense officials at an early date, and hopefully, this report will broaden the perspectives of the decision-makers as they design the military airlift forces of future years. Certainly, it will offer a pointed reminder of the in-being capability of the Air Guard’s airlift organization.

Only by such techniques as these, keyed to the planning patterns of our time, can we insure the continued vitality, well-being and military effectiveness of the National Guard.